Roles, Expectations, and Influence:

High-Risk Behaviors Among Groups of Emerging Adults

Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences

Drexel University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Jennifer Christi Woodson

Department of Psychology

July 2008

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

MASTER'S THESIS DEFENSE FORM

This is to certify that Jennifer Christi Woolson successfully defended his/her Master's thesis, on this 3rd day of July, 2008.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS' NAMES (Please Type or Print)	COMMITTEE MEMBERS' SIGNATURES
David DeMatteo CHAIRPERSON	
Michael R. Lowe	
David S. Festinger	

PROGRAM DIRECTOR Chris Reynolds

ORIGINAL FORM: PROGRAM - Student's File

File: MASTERS THESIS DEFENSE FORM

Acknowledgment

The successful completion of this masters thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of a few special people. I am first thankful for the Favor of God of which none of this would be possible. I thank my parents for their prayers and support throughout the years. I thank my mentor Dr. David DeMatteo for all his guidance and instruction throughout this entire process. He has truly been a God-sent, laboring far above and beyond the job title of graduate advisor. Thank you very much.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

This study investigated the differences between younger and older college students with respect to perceptions of engaging in high-risk group behaviors. The sample consisted of 106 college students from Drexel University. Overall, the results did not confirm the hypotheses and revealed that (1) younger students did not report significantly higher levels of willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors compared to older students; (2) older students did not report significantly higher levels of expected risk in high-risk behaviors compared to younger students; (3) older students did not report significantly lower levels of expected benefits in high-risk behaviors compared to younger students; and (4) older students did not report significantly lower levels of expected involvement in high-risk behaviors when compared to younger students. This study supplements previous research on perceptions of expected high-risk behavior, and the present analyses revealed trends that lend support to the hypotheses.

Introduction

The ability to adapt to any situation is universal to humans. We know implicitly what role must be played, what attitudes must be voiced, and what behaviors must be displayed. We also know which behaviors are most appropriate in certain situations. Individuals adapt to their environment all the time; it is how we thrive (Turke, 1990). However, during college, students may often engage in behaviors that are uncharacteristic of them based on their desire to fit in as a "college student." College students are subject to many behavioral expectations, and one common expectation is that they will engage in a variety of activities. Some of these activities may be considered high-risk, which is often rationalized as being part of what individuals in this stage of life often do. As such, to some degree, engaging in high-risk behaviors during college may be normative (Leppel, 2006).

The purpose of this study is to explore what college students think is expected of them regarding high-risk group behavior. This study will explore how the perceptions of behavioral expectations among college students influence their likelihood of engaging in certain high-risk behaviors. It is widely accepted that the expectations of others are highly influential in shaping a person's social conduct (Gergen & Taylor, 1969). Moreover, behavioral expectations are often linked to particular social environments. Therefore, when people enter a particular environment, they often take cues from the environment regarding what types of behaviors are appropriate, which may influence their behavior in that environment. This study will look at social influence and conformity because these constructs shape practices, judgments, and beliefs, and they are particularly relevant among adolescents and emerging adults (Asch, 1955).

Differences Among Younger and Older Students

Traditional college students are roughly 18 years old upon entering college. This age corresponds with the end of adolescence. As described in the literature, adolescence is a stage of life marked by peer socialization, and it is often full of tension, ambiguity, and strain (Allen, Porter, Marsh, McFarland, & McElhaney, 2005). Individuals who are successful in negotiating this period of life are often attuned to and skillful in responding to the spoken and unspoken norms within their peer group. When compared to older college students, younger college students are acutely aware of the need to adapt to various social groups, which is likely attributable to their recent exit from adolescence (Pasupathi, 1999). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that younger college students are more likely to conform to the expectations of the group. This mind-set is left over from adolescence, during which peer-groups were a powerful socializing influence and the consequences of not "obeying the rules" of this very restrictive culture may have resulted in social expulsion and isolation.

As college students age and mature, they shift their attention from the socializing environment of college to determining what job best satisfies their professional, personal, and financial needs. As students get older, they are better able to see the consequences of certain behaviors, and they are typically less inclined to conform to the expectations of the group (Pasupathi, 1999). Little by little, young people shed the mask of the "college student" and all of the expectations attached to that label. At this point, their actions become based less on social conformity and more on mature considerations such as providing, protecting, and procreation (Arnett, 1998).

Another difference between younger and older college students could be the appearance of roles in the college environment. Younger students can often get away with more because they are young and should be allowed to "sow their wild oats" before settling down. In contrast, the older students are supposed to be more mature, which presumably makes them able to see the consequences that may result from high-risk behaviors.

It is therefore important to look at what students believe is expected of them because people take on the roles they are assigned (as demonstrated by the Stanford Prison Experiment; Zimbardo, Hanley, & Banks, 1973). The expectations of the college culture are often conflicting; some level of high-risk behavior is often tolerated and perhaps expected, but some level of maturity is also demanded. Based on the relevant literature, it is reasonable to conclude that younger students might think more like adolescents and more readily conform to the expectations of the group (Allen, Porter, Marsh, McFarland, & McElhaney, 2005; Pasupathi, 1999). By contrast, older students might think more like adults, and therefore weigh the pros/cons of activities, think about possible consequences of their behavior, and be less inclined to conform to group expectations.

Emerging Adults

Emerging adulthood, as defined by Jeffrey Arnett (Arnett & Taber, 1994), is the life period between adolescence and young adulthood, approximately between the ages of 18 and 25 years. It is distinguished by relative independence from most social roles and from normative expectations of behavior. This life period is a flexible time in which one explores the possibilities of life. Many different directions remain possible, little about

the future is set, and one is free to choose almost any imaginable pursuit. Several important events happen during this time-period, which have a ripple effect throughout an individual's life. In addition, the events and training that occur during emerging adulthood provide the foundation upon which adulthood is built (Arnett, 2000).

In other stages of life, social scientists have been able to reliably predict several different characteristics reliably (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). For example, most children younger than 18 years old are still living with their parents. Emerging adulthood, by contrast, is not this straightforward. Emerging adults may be living with their parents, in a college dorm, or independently in an apartment. Emerging adulthood is the only period of life in which very little is normative. In fact, it is very hard to predict any statistical characteristics during this period reliably (Arnett, 2000).

Because emerging adults explore many different things, they may be more inclined to try risky or potentially dangerous activities (Arnett, 2000). For example, emerging adults may be more inclined to have several sexual partners, which could potentially lead to sexual transmitted diseases or unwanted pregnancy, and experiment with illicit drugs, which could potentially lead to legal involvement and poor health. Other high-risk behaviors may include dangerous driving practices. Any of these behaviors could result in running afoul of the law or causing harm to one's self or others (Arnett, 2000).

Importantly, most emerging adults do not see themselves entirely as adults (Arnett, 1998, 2000). Although they believe they have left adolescence, they also believe that they have not completely entered young adulthood. This belief reflects the subjectivity of this time period. When a person thinks they are an adult, age is only the

roughest marker of this subjective transition. Nevertheless, a few characteristics have been found in the literature that matter most to emerging adults in attaining adulthood (Arnett, 1998). These characteristics are accepting responsibility for one's self, making independent decisions, and becoming financially independent. All three of these characteristics boil down to becoming a self-sufficient person. According to Arnett (2000): "Only after these character qualities have reached fruition and financial independence has been attained do emerging adults experience a subjective change in their development status as they move out of emerging adulthood and into young adulthood" (p. 473).

Emerging adulthood is the period of life that offers the most opportunity for identity explorations in the areas of love, work, and worldview (Arnett, 2000, 2005). Identity formation involves trying out various life possibilities and gradually moving towards enduring decisions. This process begins in adolescence, but takes place mostly in emerging adulthood. Regarding love, emerging adults' exploration becomes more intimate and serious. Dating takes place in couples and is focused more on exploring potential emotional and physical intimacy. These relationships last longer, and may include sexual intercourse and cohabitation. Regarding work, emerging adults focus more on preparation for adult roles considering how their work experience has laid the foundation for the jobs they may have as adults. Educational pathways are also a part of job exploration in which emerging adults try out various possibilities by changing majors in college and possibly changing directions in graduate school (Arnett, 2000). Regarding worldviews, emerging adults may change the view they established in childhood and adolescence. During the college years, a person is exposed to many different viewpoints,

which can change their original viewpoint without establishing another in its place (Arnett, 2000). It is important to note that exploration during this time-period is not exclusively designed to prepare one for adult roles (Arnett, 1994, 2000). Rather, explorations are also part of obtaining a broad range of experiences. This is the time for a variety of romantic and sexual experiences and for trying out unusual work and educational possibilities.

These periods of exploration are not always enjoyable experiences and, at times, can be harmful to the individual in his or her future endeavors. Explorations in love may lead to disappointments, disillusionment, and rejection. Exploration in work could lead to failure to achieve the occupation most desired or the inability to find a satisfying and fulfilling job. Despite the possibilities of disappointments, emerging adults are highly optimistic about eventually reaching their desired goals (Arnett, 2000).

Of central concern to this thesis is the fact that the prevalence of several types of risky behaviors peak during emerging adulthood (Arnett, 1992). These behaviors include unprotected sex, most types of substance use, and risky driving behaviors such as driving at high speeds or driving while intoxicated (Arnett, 1992, 1994, 2005; Leppel, 2006; Nelson & Barry, 2005). Emerging adults' risk behaviors can be understood as part of their identity explorations. In other words, they obtain a wide range of experiences before setting down into the roles and responsibilities of an adult.

One source of motivation for many types of risky behavior is sensation seeking (Arnett, 1994). This willingness to take physical and social chances to explore different experiences is particularly evident during emerging adulthood. Emerging adults have the

ability to pursue novel and intense experiences more freely because they are no longer monitored closely and are not yet constrained by an adult role (Arnett, 2000).

Among the notable characteristics of emerging adulthood is the remarkable prevalence of most types of drug use. Research has found that approximately 51.1% of 18-20 year-olds and 67.4% of 21-25 year-olds have used alcohol, 22.3% of 18-20 year-olds and 18.7% of 21-25 year-olds have used illicit drugs, and 45.7% of 21-25 year-olds and 36.1% of 18-20 year-olds have engaged in binge drinking within the past 30 days (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Serves Administration [SAMHSA], 2006). Both drug use and drug abuse are most prevalent during emerging adulthood, compared to any other period of life, because young people have much greater freedom from social control during the ages of 18 to 25 years.

Emerging adulthood is characterized by five main features: identity exploration, instability, self-focus, feeling in-between, and numerous possibilities (Arnett, 2005). Each of these five features will be briefly discussed.

Identity Exploration. Identity exploration tends to occur in many different domains during emerging adulthood. It has been shown that identity exploration begins in adolescence, but continues in emerging adulthood with greater adventures (Arnett, 2000, 2005). Emerging adults have few societal roles, responsibilities, and expectations placed on them. Therefore, during these years, individuals have an extended period in which to explore and try on various possible selves in the areas of career choice, relationships, politics, and morality (Nelson & Barry, 2005). The process of identity exploration during emerging adulthood may involve high-risk behaviors such as substance use for several reasons. First, as part of their identity exploration, many

emerging adults want to have a wide range of experiences before settling into adult life. For some, that may mean experimenting with drugs. Second, constructing a stable identity can be confusing and difficult, and some emerging adults use substances as a way of relieving their identity confusion. Third, sensation seeking represents a kind of exploration as it involves the pursuit of novel and intense experiences, including substance use (Arnett, 2005).

Instability. Because of the many changes that occur during identity exploration, this time period is very unstable (Arnett, 2005). This time of experimentation and exploration for some may also be a time of instability and uncertainty. The lack of roles and responsibilities coupled with the search for one's unique identity may lead to a sense of ambivalence (Nelson & Barry, 2005). The disruptions reflected in the instability of this period of life may be a source of psychological discomfort (e.g., anxiety, depression), which could lead to substance use as a method of self-medication. Further, after a specific traumatic event, such as a relationship break-up or dropping out of college, some individuals might have a negative mood, which could lead to substance use (Arnett, 2005).

Self-Focus. Emerging adulthood is arguably the most self-focused time of life (Arnett, 2005). Most emerging adults are free from the daily obligations to others that mitigate excessive self-centeredness. According to Arnett (2005), being self-focused does not mean selfish or egocentric; rather, it means that emerging adults have greater liberty than people in other age periods to make decisions independently, without being required to obtain the permission or consent of others. Self-focus allows emerging adults to devote their energies to gaining experiences that will allow them to make the necessary

decisions leading to the foundation of their adult lives. Self-focus also means that the social network and relationships that acted as forms of social control in other age periods are less likely to exist, or are perhaps more transient. Emerging adults also spend more of their leisure time alone than any other age group except the elderly (Larson, 1990), which is another reflection both of the self-focused nature and the lack of social control during these years. Social control requires a group whose opinions the individual values and does not want to risk damaging by engaging in disapproved behavior (Arnett, 2005). When social controls are vague, behaviors that would normally violate norms, such as binge drinking or unsafe sexual practices are more likely to occur because one is not constrained by obligations or expectations.

Feeling In-Between. Emerging adulthood is the age of feeling in-between; i.e., no longer an adolescent, but not fully an adult (Arnett, 2005). The feeling of being in-between could stem from the fact that what distinguishes the transition from adolescence to adulthood in the United States and other industrialized societies is no longer clear (Arnett, 1998, 2000, 2005). The criteria to mark this transition are no longer traditional demographic indicators such as finishing education, getting married, or becoming a parent. The new criteria are now intangible, psychological, and gradual, such as accepting responsibility for one's self, making independent decisions, and obtaining financial independence (Arnett, 1998, 2005). Because emerging adults are no longer adolescents, they are now capable of deciding for themselves whether to use drugs, drive recklessly, or engage in other high-risk behaviors. Further, because they are not yet adults, they may not yet feel the commitment to adult standards of behavior and an adult

level of responsibility. People in Western societies tend to see this experimentation as part of the daring exuberance and license of youth (Arnett, 2005).

Possibilities. Emerging adulthood is the age of possibilities (Arnett, 2005). First, it is a time when people have the opportunity to make dramatic changes to their lives in areas such as appearance, personality, and worldview. Second, it is a time when hopes are high and optimism is universal. The concept of "adolescent invulnerability" is thought to play a major role in sensation-seeking and risk-taking behavior (Goldberg, Halpern-Felsher, & Millstein, 2002). Many emerging adults believe that they can get drunk and try various drugs, with little concern about getting into a car crash, becoming addicted, being arrested, or suffering any of the other negative consequences of substance use (Arnett, 2005). This perception of invulnerability has been found to play a role in risk-taking behavior (Goldberg, Halpern-Felsher, & Millstein, 2002; Weinstein, 1982, 1987). The nature of emerging adulthood does not limit itself to drug use; many other risky behaviors can be substituted.

Social Influence and Conformity

To examine how social influence and conformity are important for understanding the group behavior of emerging adults, this thesis will examine the well-known Stanford Prison Experiment (Zimbardo et al., 1973). The sample of participants for the experiment was selected from a larger group of volunteer male college students. Each volunteer had undergone an extensive interview and diagnostic testing to eliminate any pre-existing dispositions, which was a way for the researchers to obtain a "normal" sample. From this sample, half were assigned to the role of prison guards and the other half were assigned to the role of prisoners. Once these roles were assigned, this

simulated prison developed into an environment that elicited unexpectedly intense, realistic, and often pathological reactions from the participants. Despite the disturbing results, it must be emphasized that, at the outset, these individuals were undifferentiated in all dimensions from the rest of society and each other.

For the participants in the Stanford Prison Experiment, taking on a specific role produced emotional and physical changes in both groups. Individuals with the role of prisoner experienced loss of personal identity. The arbitrary control of the prisoners' behavior by the guards produced passivity, dependency, depression, and helplessness among the prisoners. Individuals with the role of guards experienced an increase in social power, status, and group identification, which made role-playing rewarding. All of the reactions during the experiment were attributed to the individuals playing their assigned roles (Zimbardo et al., 1973).

Zimbardo and his colleagues (1973) endeavored to create a prison-like situation in which the guards and prisoners were initially comparable and characterized as being "normal-average." They then observed the patterns of behavior that resulted as well as the cognitive, emotional, and attitudinal reactions that emerged. Their observations tested the dispositional hypothesis, which in this context says that the penal system is a failure in human rehabilitation because of the nature of prisoners and the nature of guards. According to this hypothesis, the nature of prisoners prevents them from following society's rules and the nature of being a guard creates a sadistic streak in their personality. What they actually acquired was a window into how expectations govern and force individuals into roles and behaviors associated with those roles. The expectations of the guards were to be tough and intimidating, while the expectations of

the prisoners were to be compliant and do nothing to anger the guards. What Zimbardo et al. (1973) taught us was that people take on the roles they are expected to play, producing the behaviors that they are expected to display.

When seeking to understand human behavior, one must consider the individual's perceptions about others' beliefs and behaviors. These considerations have been referred to as subjective norms, social norms, normative influences, social influences, and simply norms. Rimal and Real (2003) conceptualized the term "perceived norms" as being comprised of two interrelated ideas; i.e., an individual's perceptions about the prevalence of a behavior (descriptive norms) and pressures individuals experience to conform (injunctive norms). Descriptive norms and injunctive norms will be briefly described.

Descriptive norms are beliefs about how widespread a particular behavior is among identified group membership. Therefore, if a particular behavior is occurring frequently in a particular group and an individual identifies with that group, there is a greater likelihood that the individual will consider the behavior to be normative and subsequently believe it is expected as a member of that group. It should be noted that the perceived level of a behavior does not always correspond to the actual level of that behavior. Researchers call this mismatched estimation "social projection" (Rimal & Real, 2003).

Injunctive norms are the extent to which individuals feel pressured to engage in a behavior. Pressure can come from two sources: perceived threats or perceived benefit. These exaggerated and actual perceptions of membership expectations create the majority of effects across group members. Because these norms are not created by the individual, but seem to infect a group, there must be a means of transmission. Communication is the

form of transmission in which group members express their identity and conform to the perceived norms (Rimal & Real, 2003).

Norms, according to Rimal and Real (2003), are the codes of conduct that either prescribe or proscribe behaviors that members of a group can enact, with four important features. First, there is no norm unless not conforming to some standard of behavior leads to "punishment." Second, norms are fluid concepts that are constructed through social interaction. Third, the existence of a norm depends on an individual's group identity. Fourth, norms are constructed, understood, and disseminated among group members through communication.

Human beings are social creatures, and the primary drawback from our high level of socialization is the effect we have on each other:

> People affect each other in many different ways. As social animals, we are drawn by the attractiveness of others and aroused by their presence, stimulated by their activity and embarrassed by their attention. We are influenced by the actions of others, entertained by their performances and sometimes persuaded by their arguments. We are inhibited by the observation of others and made less guilty by their complicity. We are threatened by the power of others and angered by their attack. We are also reassured by the support of others and sustained by their love (Latané, 1981, p. 343).

Latané called these effects and others like them "social impact"; i.e., the great variety of changes in physiological states and subjective feelings, motives and emotions, cognitions and beliefs, and values and behavior that occur in an individual because of the real, implied, or imagined presence or actions of other individuals. Therefore, when a number

of social forces act on a group, the amount of impact experienced by each group member is a multiplicative function of the Strength (status and power), Immediacy (closeness in space and time), and Number of sources present (Latané, 1981).

Insko, Smith, Alicke, Wade, and Taylor (1985) researched the reasons for the increasing effect of group size on conformity, which is generally seen as a power function described by social impact theory. They noted that the relationship between group size and conformity is generally statistically positive. However, to explore this relationship in more detail, they focused on the difference between one and four confederates in an Asch-type experiment. Asch's experiment involved having participants judge the length of lines. Out of five participants, four would be confederates told to give unanimous wrong answers and the fifth participant would merely be told that the experiment was about perception (Asch, 1955).

Insko and colleagues (1985) assumed that four confederates are likely to be more influential than one, and they offered two explanations for this belief. First, four other group members are more influential than one other group member because the larger group produces an increased concern with being right (or not being wrong). Second, four other group members are more influential than one other group member because the larger group produces an increased concern with being liked (or not being unliked). The first explanation was found to be true because of the implicit reliance on an agreed upon measure of truth, together with the related assumption that agreement among four people is more likely if their judgments are in fact based on an external cause. The second explanation was found to be true because of the greater potential benefit or harm to self-esteem implied by the consensus of a larger group (Insko et al., 1985).

The Character of Conformity

From the time when Asch (1955) carried out his famous study on conformity, numerous studies have attempted to discover the personality characteristics of the conforming individual. His results found two extremes in the response of the participants. On one side, participants' answers were always completely independent and never agreed with the wrong answers of the majority. On the other side, participants' answers usually went with the majority. These two patterns were consistent throughout the experiment (Asch, 1955). Crutchfield (1955) followed up on this research when he investigated the divergences between high conformist and independent people on certain personality variables. It was found that the independent person showed more intellectual effectiveness, ego strength, leadership ability, and maturity of social relations than the conformist. Furthermore, independents did not have inferiority feelings, rigid and excessive self-control, or authoritarian attitudes. Conformists, on the other hand, were described as submissive, compliant, and overly accepting with respect to authority (Crutchfield, 1955).

Some years later, Smith (1967) devised a questionnaire to measure nonconformity that divided people into three groups: rebels, conformers, and independents. He found that the conformers (those with high scores) showed a readiness to accept socially approved behavior in a routine and unquestioning fashion. The rebels (those with low scores) gave responses indicating that they could be depended on to take a non-approving stance on a wide range of socially approved types of behavior. The independents demonstrated ambivalence toward socio-cultural norms; they accepted some norms, but

rejected others. However, they neither categorically accepted nor rejected the norms merely because the majority of people accepted them (Smith, 1967).

Conformity to group norms or to role expectations can lead to destructive behavior (Milgram, 1963; Zimbardo et al., 1973), distorted perceptions of reality, and/or poor decision-making (Asch, 1952). To countermand this potential for destructive behavior, Hornsey, Majkut, Terry, and McKimmie (2003) examined some conditions under which one might expect defiance, rather than compliance, to group norms. Central to their research was an examination of normative influence; that is, the notion that people are more likely to conform to group norms in public than in private because they are motivated to avoid social censure. They believed that although the fear of social sanctions is a real phenomenon, there are circumstances under which a person's desire to be right might override their need to be accepted. This is true typically when a person is deeply invested in their attitude (Hornsey et al., 2003).

To investigate the assertion that there are times when people want to be right, Hornsey et al. (2003) looked at weak and strong moral bases for an individual's attitudes. They found that participants who had a weak moral basis for their attitude shifted toward the group norm in relation to their private behavioral intentions (conformity), whereas those who had a strong moral basis for their attitude were not affected by the group norm (nonconformity). A trend was also found among those who had a strong moral basis for their attitude towards counter-conformity, so there were stronger intentions when they perceived group opposition than when they perceived group support (Hornsey et al., 2003). Thus, it seems that the effects of a person's moral basis have a greater impact than attitude, strength, and perceived strength of societal norms. Therefore, people with a

weak moral basis for their attitude were more intent on privately demonstrating their support when they were in a majority with respect to their group than when they were in a minority. People with a strong moral basis to their attitudes showed as much intent to act privately in line with their attitude when they faced group opposition as when they faced group support. Also, there was evidence that those with a strong moral basis for their attitude were more determined to act out publicly their attitudes when they had group opposition than when they had group support (Hornsey et al., 2003).

Hornsey et al. (2003) offered two explanations for this unusual reaction. One possibility is that people remain committed to the group, but are motivated to change the attitudes of others through public displays of their minority views. So rather than integrating the group norms, these people attempt to shift the group culture to fit their own personal values. A second possibility for this phenomenon is that the participants discounted the group's norms as being invalid. Therefore, a group member with a minority view psychologically detaches from the group and reconfigures his or her group identity along personal lines or with a different group. Counter-conformity therefore represents disengagement from the current group and reintegration to the norms and values of a different group (Hornsey et al., 2003).

Conformity and Young People

One example of conformity in the college setting can be seen in binge drinking, which has remained at a constant level for many years (SAMHSA, 2006). In addition to health, concerns that may result from binge drinking, binge drinkers are more likely to engage in other high-risk behaviors, such as unplanned sexual activity and property destruction (Leppel, 2006). According to Leppel (2006), the steady levels of binge

drinking result from the college culture and the behaviors and activities that are expected at college. She investigated this line of reasoning by looking at the cultural application of the social bond theory, which is the connection between the individual and society. According to this theory, deviant behavior occurs when the social bond is weakened or lacking. Additionally, she looked at binge drinking through the traditional societal culture and the secondary college culture because both of these forces are pulling at a college student. Leppel (2006) compared and contrasted the traditional culture and the college culture through the medium of social bond theory to explain the deviant behavior of college students.

Social bond theory has four elements: attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief (Durkin, Wolfe, & Clark, 1999). The first element, attachment, refers to an individual's ties to others. In traditional cultural, this would mean family members and relatives who encourage the student to attend college and avoid deviant behavior, such as binge drinking. According to social bond theory, individuals with strong attachment are less likely to engage in deviant behavior. In college culture, this may be a fraternity brother or sorority sister, or roommates (Leppel, 2006). However, in the college culture a strong attachment promotes the pursuit of activities related to the culture, such as binge drinking, because these activities support the college culture.

The second element, involvement, consists of the amount of time spent in behaviors promoted by society. The traditional culture expects the student to spend many hours studying for classes. Therefore, if a college student is more involved with the traditional culture; their time is spent studying for classes. In contrast, the college culture perceives binge drinking as an activity that builds camaraderie with other students, even

though it decreases time available for studying (Leppel, 2006). Individuals more involved with the college culture often place a higher premium on socializing with their fellow students than acquiring an education.

The third element, commitment, represents the time, energy, and other resources already invested in behaviors promoted by society, which the student would not want to endanger. In traditional culture, commitment would be students spending their time maximizing their education. Hence, those individuals who are committed to the traditional culture believe that all of their energy and resources, including money, should be directed towards their education. Therefore, these students would not waste money on frivolous activities like going out to a club with friends. In college culture, commitment would be the amount of money and energy the student has invested in the social activities of college (Leppel, 2006). Individuals committed to the college culture would spend their money and energy making sure they know and participate in college activities, such as going to clubs and attending student organizations.

The fourth element, belief, concerns the acceptance of the social value system; therefore, weakening a student's beliefs increases the likelihood he or she will engage in deviant behavior. In traditional culture, this includes a high value on diligence and hard work, respect for authority, and acceptance of conventional viewpoints. In college culture, this would be inattentiveness, disregard for authority, and dismissal of conventional viewpoints (Leppel, 2006). When binge drinking is viewed as deviant behavior, social bond theory implies that strengthening social bonds will lessen the behavior. However, when binge drinking is viewed as mainstream behavior encouraged

by the culture, either the bonds to the culture that support the behavior must be weakened or the culture must be altered to eliminate the deviant behavior (Leppel, 2006).

According to Pasupathi (1999), most theories of social influence do not consider adult development; however, theoretical and empirical works in life span developmental psychology suggest that age may reduce susceptibility to social influence. Conformity researchers have consistently found that individuals who are concerned with what others think of them, less sure of their own beliefs and knowledge, and less self-confident are more likely to conform to others even when this means responding incorrectly (Asch, 1952; Hornsey et al., 2003; Insko et al., 1985; Rimal & Real, 2003). In contrast, adult developmental research suggests that conformity may vary as a function of age so that as people get older, they display less concern with what others think of them, less interest in new acquaintances and social partners, greater self-certainty, more reliance on their existing knowledge, and more stable beliefs (Pasupathi, 1999). As predicted, Pasupathi (1999) found that older people, compared with their younger counterparts, displayed lower rates of social conformity.

Hypotheses

Based on existing research, the following hypotheses were examined in this study:
(1) Younger college students will report significantly higher levels of willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors when compared to older college students; and
(2) Older college students will report significantly higher levels of expected risk, lower levels of expected benefits, and lower levels of expected involvement in high-risk behaviors when compared to younger college students.

For the purpose of this study, "younger students" were operationally defined as participants that were freshman and sophomores, approximately between the ages of 18 and 20 years, and "older students" were operationally defined as those participants that were juniors and seniors, approximately between the ages of 21 and 25 years. The pre-juniors at Drexel University were included in the group corresponding to their age. Although treating age as a continuous variable would provide a more sensitive measure, the goal of this study was to compare older students and younger students. Therefore, to maintain discrete categories, age was treated as a dichotomous variable.

Methods

Participants

A sample of 106 college students was recruited to examine the relationship between age and willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors. The sample demographics are presented in Table 1. With a medium effect size (.25) and an alpha level of .05, a minimum of 128 participants were needed to obtain adequate statistical power (.80) for detecting statistically significant differences for the primary analyses (Cohen, 1988). As such, the primary analyses were under-powered, which will be discussed later in this thesis. The decision to use a medium effect size was based on a review of literature, which suggests that there will be a moderately noticeable difference between younger and older college students. Participants were recruited through advertisements across campus and the network of student research participation. Because this study was examining the perceptions of traditional college students, all participates were between the ages of 18 and 25 years; non-traditional students were not eligible to participate. Participants were required to be fluent in English, not currently under the influence of drugs or alcohol, and

not suffering from active psychosis or another major mental illness. Participants were divided into two groups based on age: younger students (n=57) and older students (n=49). The demographics for the two subsamples are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Preliminary between-group analyses of the subsamples did not find significant differences for gender, χ^2 (1, n = 106) = .38, p = .54, race, χ^2 (5, n = 106) = 9.87, p = .08, or ethnicity, χ^2 (1, n = 106) = .52, p = .47.

Table 1: Demographics for the Entire Sample (N = 106)

		Frequency	Percent	M (SD)
Gender				
	Male	19	17.9	
	Female	87	82.1	
Age				20.5 (1.68)
	18	10	9.4	
	19	24	22.6	
	20	23	21.7	
	21	22	20.8	
	22	15	14.2	
	23	6	5.7	
	24	3	2.8	
	25	3	2.8	
Race				
	Caucasian	71	67.0	
	African-American	10	9.4	
	Asian	20	18.9	
	Biracial	3	2.8	
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	1	.9	
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	.9	
Ethnicity				
	Hispanic/Latino	3	2.8	
	Not Hispanic/Latino	103	97.2	
Year in School				
	Freshman	23	21.7	
	Sophomore	29	27.4	
	Pre-junior	13	12.3	
	Junior	18	17.0	
	Senior	23	21.7	

Table 2: Younger Subsample Demographics (n = 57)

		Frequency	Percent	*M* (SD)
Gender				
	Male	9	15.8	
	Female	48	84.2	
Age				19.23 (.73)
	18	10	17.5	
	19	24	42.1	
	20	23	40.4	
Race				
	Caucasian	36	63.2	
	African-American	6	10.5	
	Asian	15	26.3	
Ethnicity				
	Hispanic/Latino	1	1.8	
	Not Hispanic/Latino	56	98.2	
Year in School				
	Freshman	22	38.6	
	Sophomore	27	47.4	
	Pre-junior	5	8.8	
	Junior	3	5.3	

Table 3: Older Subsample Demographics (n = 49)

		Frequency	Percent	*M* (SD)
Gender				
	Male	10	20.4	
	Female	39	79.6	
Age				21.98 (1.18)
	21	22	44.9	
	22	15	30.6	
	23	6	12.2	
	24	3	6.1	
	25	3	6.1	
Race				
	Caucasian	35	71.4	
	African-American	4	8.2	
	Asian	5	10.2	
	Biracial	3	6.1	
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	1	2.0	
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	2.0	
Ethnicity				
	Hispanic/Latino	2	4.1	
	Not Hispanic/ Latino	47	95.9	
Year in School				
	Freshman	1	2.0	
	Sophomore	2	4.1	
	Pre-junior	8	16.3	
	Junior	15	30.6	
	Senior	23	46.9	

Procedures

Because no identifying data were collected, we asked the Drexel University Institutional Review Board (IRB) waive the informed consent requirement. Because the only document linking the participant to the study would have been the informed consent document, we believed a waiver of informed consent was justified pursuant to federal regulations. As an incentive, one participant was randomly selected to receive a $50 gift card. All participants completed a demographic sheet (see Appendix A), vignette survey

(see Appendix B), and the Cognitive Appraisal of Risky Events (CARE) questionnaire (see Appendix C) via the online survey systems of Sona System and Survey Monkey.

Demographic Sheet. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire that asked about their age, year in school, racial and ethnic group, gender, and religious affiliation. It also asked questions that assessed level of maturity (or independence). The questions assessing maturity were derived from questions used in previous research studies on maturity.

Survey. All participants answered questions related to a vignette describing a typical college scene (i.e., house party) with some of the more prevalent high-risk behavior possibilities (e.g., binge drinking, risky sexual behavior, physical altercations, auto racing, drug use, vandalism). Following the vignette was a series of questions assessing what the participants perceived was their expected level of involvement in these high-risk activities. The survey questions were answered on a Likert-type scale.

Cognitive Appraisal of Risky Events (CARE). The CARE (Fromme, Katz, & River, 1997) is a 30-item measure that assesses risk, benefit, and expected involvement across the following six factors: risky sexual behavior, heavy drinking, illicit drug use, aggressive and illegal behaviors, irresponsible academic/work behaviors, and high-risk sports. The CARE uses a 7-point Likert scale to quantify emerging adults' perceptions of the risks and benefits associated with involvement in risky activities. The use of the CARE was intended to provide information regarding how emerging adults think about high-risk behaviors. The CARE has been validated on multiple samples of emerging adults (e.g., Fromme et al., 1997). Research indicates Cronbach's alphas ranging from .64 to .90, which suggests adequate internal validity, and 10-day test-retest reliability

coefficients from .51 to .65 for expected risk and .58 to .79 for expected benefit (Fromme et al., 1997), which suggest low but acceptable test-retest reliability.

Results

Some of the questions on the demographic form assessed participants' baseline maturity (independence) so future analyses could determine if this variable acted as a moderator. A univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the significance of maturity in terms of willingness to participate in high-risk behavior. The ANOVA found a significant difference between younger and older students on two questions. The first question - "I make most of the important decisions in my life with little input from parents" - had a significantly higher mean in the older group ($M = 3.14$, SD = 1.21) than the younger group ($M = 2.60$, SD = 1.22), $F(1, 104) = 5.32$, $p = .023$, $\eta^2 = .05$. The second question - "I consider myself financially independent from my parents" - had a significantly higher mean in the older group ($M = 2.63$, SD = 1.40) than the younger group ($M = 1.88$, SD = 1.23), $F(1, 104) = 8.81$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .08$.

A factorial ANOVA was conducted to whether there were interaction effects between the two significant maturity questions and age, but no interaction effects were found, $F(10, 87) = .90$, $p = .53$. However, because the analyses were not sufficiently powered (44%), the analyses may not have detected an interaction that actually exists. Two questions approached significance with 45% power; "please indicate if religion is important in your life," with a higher mean in the younger group ($M = .60$, SD = .50) than the older group ($M = .42$, SD = .50), $F(1, 103) = 3.42$, $p = .067$, $\eta^2 = .03$; and "I feel like an adult," with a higher mean in the older group ($M = 3.94$, SD = .78) than the younger group ($M = 3.60$, SD = 1.07), $F(1, 104) = 3.47$, $p = .065$, $\eta^2 = .03$.

The vignette questions were designed to evaluate the participants' levels of reported willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors at a typical college party. Separate univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were run on the following variables: likelihood to join in the auto racing, likelihood to join in the dancing, likelihood to join in the drinking games, likelihood to join in smoking marijuana, likelihood to join in taking pharmaceutical drugs and likelihood to join in the sexual activities with their partner. None of these ANOVAs revealed a significant difference between younger and older students in terms of willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors. However, because the analyses were statistically under-powered, they may not have detected any between-group differences that actually exist. The levels of statistical power for racing, dancing, drinking games, smoking marijuana, pharmaceutical drugs, and sexual activities were 7%, 11%, 30%, 7%, 12%, and 6%, respectively.

The data from the CARE were analyzed by conducting independent sample t-tests comparing the younger and older students on each of the six factors of the CARE. As will be discussed, only two of the six analyses revealed significant differences. Although younger students reported higher levels of expected risk on the heavy drinking factor of the CARE ($M = 4.74$ vs. 4.24,), the difference was not significant, $t(104) = 1.59$, $p = .057$. Younger students reported higher levels of expected benefit for illicit drug use factor of the CARE ($M = 2.14$ vs. 1.77), but the difference was not significant, $t(92.41) = 1.450$, $p = .075$. Younger students reported higher levels of expected benefit on the aggressive/illegal behavior factor of the CARE ($M = 1.83$ vs. 1.54), but the difference was not significance, $t(86.74) = 1.492$, $p = .069$. Also, older students reported higher

levels of past involvement on the aggressive/illegal behaviors factor of the CARE (M = 1.05 vs. .69), but the result was not significant, t(104) = -1.57, p= .066.

Results of these analyses revealed significant between-group differences on two of the six CARE factors. First, results revealed that older students reported significantly higher levels of expected benefit on the high-risk sports factor of the CARE (M = 5.20 vs. 4.69), $t(104) = -1.656$, $p = .05$, r = .14. Second, older students reported significantly higher levels of expected involvement for the heavy drinking factor of the CARE (M = 3.95 vs. 3.07), $t(104) = -2.289$, $p = .012$, r = .20.

Because the analyses comparing younger and older participants did no reveal many group differences, we analyzed whether maturity level would achieve such differentiation. To examine if maturity level is related to risk-taking behavior, the results of the study instruments were analyzed for low-maturity and high-maturity participants. Maturity was defined by the eight questions on the demographic form: i.e., (1) "My plans for the future are realistic"; (2) "I have independently arrived at my own belief system about the world (even though it may be the same as my parents)"; (3) "I discuss with my parents the "ups and downs" in my life"; (4) "I do most things impulsively, with very little forethought"; (5) "I feel like an adult"; (6) "I accept responsibility for all of my actions"; (7) "I make most of the important decisions in my life with little input from my parents"; and (8) "I consider myself financially independent from my parents." These questions were answered on a 5-point Likert scale, and high- and low-maturity groups were defined using the Likert-scale scores. Specifically for questions 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8, participants that reported 3 or higher were classified as high-maturity and participants that reported 2 or lower were classified as low-maturity. For questions 3 and 4,

participants that reported 2 or lower were classified as high-maturity and participants that reported 3 or higher were classified as low-maturity. A final maturity level was derived by (1) combining the eight variables and obtaining the mean, and (2) performing a median split to form the low-maturity and high-maturity groups.

The analysis of the vignette questions did not revealed any statistically significant differences between low-maturity and high-maturity participants.

The analysis of the six CARE factors revealed several statistically significant differences between low-maturity and high-maturity participants. First, results revealed that low-maturity participants reported significantly lower levels of expected benefit on the high-risk sports factor of the CARE (M = 4.58 vs. 5.22), $t(104) = -2.077$, $p = .02$, r = .20. Second, results revealed that low-maturity participants reported significantly lower levels of expected involvement on the high-risk sports factor of the CARE (M = 2.87 vs. 3.50), $t(104) = -2.020$, $p = .021$, r = .19. Third, results revealed that low-maturity participants reported significantly lower levels of past involvement on the illicit drug use factor of the CARE (M = .94 vs. 2.23), $t(76.47) = -1.708$, $p = .04$, r = .19. Fourth, results revealed that low-maturity participants reported significantly lower levels of past involvement on the academic/work behavior factor of the CARE (M =3.29 vs. 4.85), $t(90.33) = -1.747$, $p = .042$, r = .18.

To examine if the lack of sufficient statistical power was the reason for the nonsignificant results of the main analyses, the results of the primary measures are presented by age group and gender in Table 4.

Table 4: Results of Main Analyses (by age group and gender)

	Female (younger-older) *M*(SD)	Male (younger-older) *M*(SD)
Vignette Survey		
Join in auto racing	1.38(.76) - 1.23(.63)	1.44(.73) - 1.70(1.06)
Join in dancing	3.98(1.14) - 3.90(1.10)	3.44(1.33) - 3.10(1.20)
Join in drinking games	2.98(1.50) - 3.33(1.24)	3.44(1.51) - 3.90(1.45)
Join in smoking marijuana	1.88(1.38) - 1.72(.86)	2.44(1.42) - 2.50(1.35)
Join in pharmaceutical drugs	1.21(.62) - 1.21(.57)	1.67(1.12) - 1.10(.32)
Join in sexual activities	2.17(1.24) - 1.77(1.00)	2.67(1.65) - 3.80(1.14)
CARE Factors		
Expected Consequences		
Heavy Drinking	4.74(1.62) - 4.53(1.39)	4.74(2.01) - 3.13(1.41)
Past Involvement		
Aggressive Illegal Behavior	.72(1.14) - 1.03(1.32)	.52 (.81) - 1.10(1.47)
Expected Benefit		
Heavy Drinking	2.58(1.59) - 2.57(1.12)	2.48(1.81) - 4.00(1.62)
Expected Benefit		
Illicit Drug Use	2.10(1.60) - 1.64(.77)	2.33(1.94) - 2.27(1.43)
Expected Benefit		
Aggressive Illegal Behaviors	1.89(1.38) - 1.52(.71)	1.51(.56) - 1.60(.52)
Expected Benefit		
High Risk Sports	4.62(1.69) - 5.17(1.57)	5.06(1.89) - 5.35(.89)

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine factors related to high-risk group behavior among emerging adults in the college environment. Specifically, this study examined the contribution of social influence and conformity pressures, which are

evident throughout this environment. The focus was on whether there are differences between younger and older college students in their reported willingness to engage in high-risk activities. Overall, the results did not confirm the hypotheses and revealed that (1) younger students did not report significantly higher levels of willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors compared to older students; (2) older students did not report significantly higher levels of expected risk in high-risk behaviors compared to younger students; (3) older students did not report significantly lower levels of expected benefits in high-risk behaviors compared to younger students; and (4) older students did not report significantly lower levels of expected involvement in high-risk behaviors when compared to younger students. This study supplements previous research on perceptions of expected high-risk behavior, and the present analyses revealed trends that lend support to the hypotheses.

The analyses of data collected from the vignette appear to reveal a trend that lends support to the hypothesis that younger students will report higher levels of willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors. The analyses of data collected from the first section of the Cognitive Appraisal of Risky Events (CARE) regarding the expected negative consequences of high-risk activities appear to uncover a trend that provides support for the reverse of the hypothesis that older students will report higher levels of expected risk than younger students. The analyses of the data collected from the second section of the CARE regarding the expected positive consequences of high-risk activities appear to expose a trend that offers support for the hypothesis that older students will report lower levels of expected benefit than younger students. The third and fourth sections of the CARE regarding expected involvement and frequency of involvement of high-risk

activities found significant differences between older and younger students in expected involvement of high-risk activities in support of the hypothesis that older students will report lower levels of expected involvement in high-risk behaviors.

Hypothesis 1

This hypothesis stated that younger college students would report significantly higher levels of willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors compared to older college students. Although the results of this study do not support this hypothesis, there are some trends in the data that are worthy of comment. The vignette and its corresponding questions were used to look at the reported level of willingness of younger students versus older students to engage in high-risk activities. It was found that for five of the six questions, the younger college students' mean score indicated higher levels of willingness to engage in the activities when compared to the older college students' mean score. Although these findings were not statistically significant, which likely resulted from low statistical power, they provide some support for the position that younger students are more willing to engage in high-risk activities. Specifically, the younger students reported higher levels of willingness to participate with the group in auto racing, dancing, smoking marijuana, taking unknown pharmaceutical drugs, and having sex with their partner at a party, whereas the older students were more willing to joining in with drinking games at a party. Research has established that social influence is a factor in college students' decisions to participate in high-risk activities (Leppel, 2006; Pederson, LaBrie, & Lac, 2008), and the findings of the present study suggest that some college students – i.e., those who are younger – are more susceptible to conformity pressures in this decision-making process.

Hypothesis 2

This hypothesis stated that older college students would report significantly higher levels of expected risk, lower levels of expected benefits, and lower levels of expected involvement in high-risk behaviors when compared to younger college students. Although the results of this study do not support this hypothesis, there are some trends in the data that are worthy of comment. A series of independent sample t-tests was conducted to compare the younger and older students for differences on the six factors of the CARE. The two factors – one for expected benefit and the other for expected involvement – that found significant differences between younger and older students indicate that older students reported higher levels of expected benefits for the high-risk sports factor and for the expected involvement of the heavy drinking factor than younger students. The analyses of the four factors that approached significance must be noted. Those analyses revealed that younger students reported higher levels of expected benefits for the illicit drug use factor and the aggressive/illegal behavior factor. In addition, the younger students reported higher levels of expected consequences of the heavy drinking factor and the older students reported higher levels of past involvement of the aggressive/illegal behavior factor, which were contrary findings to what was predicted.

The analyses using maturity as a differentiating factor revealed several statistically significant differences among low-maturity and high-maturity participants regarding high-risk behaviors. For each factor of the CARE that was significant, the low-maturity participants reported lower levels of the high-risk activity than the high-maturity participants. It would seem that age and level of maturity are not as interconnected as

previously assumed, and perhaps more attention should be devoted to examining the effects of maturity level on reported willingness to engage in high-risk behaviors.

Moderators

A moderator analysis was conducted to explain the unexpected trend found in the analyses for the first part of the second hypothesis. To accomplish this, questions were asked on the demographic form to assess a participant's baseline level of maturity (independence). This was important because the greater the level of maturity of an individual, the less likely they will conform to group activities (Pasupathi, 1999). The analysis for two of these questions found significant differences between younger and older college students. In addition, the analysis of two other questions approached a significant difference between younger and older college students.

The first question was "I make most of the important decisions in my life with little input from parents." Results revealed that older students make important decisions without their parents significantly more often than younger students. Previous research has found this to be a characteristic that emerging adults endorse to be necessary to attain adulthood (Arnett, 2000). Therefore, it is befitting to confirm that older students make more decisions about their lives without their parents input. The second question was "I consider myself financially independent from my parents." Results revealed that older students are significantly more often financially independent. This also has been found in previous research to be a characteristic of adulthood that emerging adults affirm is necessary for adulthood (Arnett, 2000). Therefore, it is suitable to confirm that older students are more often independent financially from their parents than younger students.

Although the analysis of the next two questions only approached significant differences, they are important because one illustrates another characteristic of adulthood and the other illustrates the exploration and acquisition of new viewpoints, which is typical of emerging adulthood. For the first question - "please indicate if religion is important in your life" - results reveled that younger students indicated that religion was more important to them than older students. This finding, although not a significant difference between younger and older students, illustrates the exploration and acquisition of other viewpoints as one progress through the emerging adult years (Arnett, 2005). It would seem that the majority of younger students believe religion is important in their life, but, it seems that older students lose this view, possibly due to all of the philosophies that college students are exposed to during their college years. The second question was "I feel like an adult." Results revealed that older students feel more like an adult than younger students. Despite the fact that these findings are not significant, previous research has designated feeling like an adult as a characteristic that emerging adults endorse to be necessary in obtaining adulthood. These nonsignificant questions were described because a study conducted with a large sample and, therefore more statistical power, may find significant differences between younger and older college students on similar items.

Limitations

The present study had several limitations. The primary analyses for the vignette questions and demographic questions were statistically underpowered due to the sample size, which may have resulted in Type II errors. Another potential problem in this study was that the age range of the participants was 18 to 25 years, but there were not many 23

to 25 year olds. As such, the sample was skewed to the younger side, which could have affected the results. In addition, the majority of the sample was recruited from the psychology department of one university on the east coast. This is meaningful because having an entire sample from one university in one geographic location potentially limits the generalizability of significant findings to the population of emerging adults. Another limitation is the manner in which maturity was defined – i.e., median split of several items. The use of a valid and reliable measure of maturity should be considered in future research. A final limitation with the current study was the lack of males, which may have made the sample less representative.

Future Research Directions

Future researchers should increase the number of participants and use a more demographically diverse sample of emerging adults. In regards to demographics, recruitment should take place across multiple majors in different universities in different geographic locations, with special attention paid to increasing the number of males and the size of the older group. Data recruitment and collection time should be taken into consideration to see if differences are more detectable in the beginning of the school year versus the end of the school year. In addition, considerations of using maturity as a grouping for participants could also be used. If these results prove true than the major benefit would be an understanding that in order to begin constructing supports services that will remove the risky expectation that students go into college with. The indulgent nature evident within this environment must be dealt with first in order to move forward with these support services.

References

Allen, J. P., Porter, M. R., Marsh, P., McFarland F. C., & McElhaney, K. B. (2005). The two faces of adolescents' success with peers: Adolescent popularity, social adaptation and deviant behavior. *Child Development, 76(3)*, 747-760.

Arnett, J. J. (1992). Reckless behavior in adolescence: A developmental perspective. *Developmental Review, 12*, 339-373.

Arnett, J. J., & Taber, S. (1994). Adolescence terminable and interminable: When does adolescence end? *Journal of Youth and Adolescences, 23*(5), 517-537.

Arnett, J. J. (1994). Sensation seeking: A new conceptualization and a new scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16*(2), 289-296.

Arnett, J. J. (1998). Learning to stand alone: The contemporary American transition to adulthood in cultural and historical context. *Human Development, 41*, 295-315.

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469-480.

Arnett, J. J. (2005). The developmental context of substance use in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Drug Issues, 5*(2), 235-254.

Asch, S. E. (1952). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership, and men* (pp. 393-401). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.

Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American, 193*(5), 31-35.

Crutchfield, R. S. (1955). Conformity and character. *American Psychologist, 10*, 191-198.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Durkin, K. F., Wolfe, T. W., & Clark, G. (1999). Social bond theory and binge drinking among college students: A multivariate analysis. *College Student, 33*, 450-462.

Fromme, K., Katz, E. C., & River, K. (1997). Outcome expectancies and risk-taking behavior. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 21*(4), 421-442.

Gergen, K. J., & Taylor, M. G. (1969). Social expectancy and self-presentation in a status hierarchy. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 5*, 79-92.

Goldberg, J. H., Halpern-Felsher, B. L., & Millstein, S. G. (2002). Beyond invulnerability: The importance of benefit in adolescents' decision to drink alcohol. *Health Psychology, 21*(5), 477-484.

Hakstian, A. R., Roed, J. C., & Lind, J. C. (1979). Two-sample T^2 procedure and the assumption of homogeneous covariance matrices. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 1255-1263.

Hornsey, M. J., Majkut, L., Terry, D. J., & McKimmie, B. M. (2003). On being loud and proud: Non-conformity and counter-conformity to group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 319-335.

Insko, C. A., Smith, R. H., Alicke, M. D., Wade, J., & Taylor, S. (1985). Conformity and group size: the concern with being right and the concern with being liked. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11*(1), 41-50.

Larson, R. W. (1990). The solitary side of life: An examination of the time people spend alone from childhood to old age. *Developmental Review, 10*, 155-183.

Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist, 36*(4), 343-356.

Leppel, K. (2006). College binge drinking: deviant versus mainstream behavior. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 32*, 519-525.

Martin, J. D., Blair, G. E., & Bottoms, S. A. H (1979). A correlation of Barron's ego strength scale and Smith's non-conformity scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 39*, 959-963.

Nelson, L. J. & Barry, C. M. (2005). Distinguishing features of emerging adulthood: The role of self-classification as an adult. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20*(2), 242-262.

Pasupathi, M. (1999). Age difference in response to conformity pressure for emotional and non-emotional material. *Psychology and Aging, 14*(1), 170-174.

Pedersen, E. R., LaBrie, J. W., & Lax A. (2008). Assessment of perceived and actual alcohol norms in varying contexts: Exploring social impact theory among college students. *Addictive Behaviors, 33*, 552-564.

Rimal, R. N. & Real, K. (2003). Understanding the influence of perceived norms on behaviors. *Communication Theory, 13*(2), 184-203.

Smith, R. J. (1967). Exploration in nonconformity. *Journal of Social Psychology, 71*, 133-150.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Serves Administration. (2006). *Results from the 2005 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: National findings*. Rockville, MD: Department of Health and Human Services.

Turke, P. W. (1990). Which humans behave adaptively, and why does it matter? *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *11*, 305-339.

U.S. Census Bureau (2007). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 2007*. Available at http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/.

Weinstein, N. D. (1982). Unrealistic optimism about susceptibility to health problems. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *5*(4), 441-460.

Weinstein, N. D. (1987). Unrealistic optimism about susceptibility to health problems: Conclusions from a community-wide sample. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *10*(5), 481-500.

Zimbardo, P., Hanley, C., & Banks, C. (1973). Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison. *International Journal of Criminology and Psychology*, *1*, 69-97.

Appendix A: Background Information

Please circle your gender:

Female Male

Age:___

Please circle your year in school:

Freshmen Sophomore Pre-Junior Junior Senior

Please circle your race and ethnicity:

(1) Race: Caucasian African-American American Indian/Alaska Native Asian Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander

(2) Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino Not Hispanic/Latino

Please indicate if religion is important in your life.

Yes No

Please indicate your level of agreement using the following rating scale: 1= completely disagree; 2= disagree; 3= neutral; 4= agree; 5= complete agree

My plans for the future are realistic. ___

I have independently arrived at my own belief system about the world (even though it may be the same as my parents). ___

I discuss with my parents the "ups and downs" in my life. ___

I do most things impulsively, with very little forethought. ___

I feel like an adult. ___

I accept responsibility for all of my actions. ___

I make most of the important decisions in my life with little input from my parents. ____

I consider myself financially independent from my parents. ___

Appendix B: Sample Vignette and Questions

Directions: Read the following description of a college party and answer the questions that follow.

A friend of yours has invited you to a party. The party is in a big three-story townhouse in town. When you get there, you see that the place is full of people your age having a great time. This townhouse is at the end of a long row of houses about a quarter of a mile long with room in between the rows for three or four cars to go down the street side by side. Some people are in the street racing their cars. On the first floor of the townhouse, there is popular dance music playing and enough room for many people to dance. In the kitchen, there are several tables with a variety of great food. Also in the kitchen are pyramids a few feet high of empty beer cans and a refrigerator full of more cold beer. The pyramid of beer is continually getting taller because of the drinking game that is going on. The second floor is filled with people in several living rooms. Some rooms have people have people smoking marijuana. Some rooms have tables with glass bowls filled with different pharmaceutical drugs that people had brought with them. The people in these rooms are sitting around on couches grabbing out handfuls to take. On the third floor are several bedrooms. There are a few couples in each room getting intimate with their partners.

Using the following scale indicate your willingness to engage in these activities. Circle the most appropriate response.

1=Definitely Not Willing

2=Probably Not Willing

3=Neutral

4=Probably Willing

5=Definitely Willing

1. How likely is it for you to join in the auto racing?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How likely is it for you to join in the dancing?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How likely is it for you to join in the drinking game?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How likely is it for you to join in smoking marijuana?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How likely is it for you to join in taking pharmaceutical drugs?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How likely is it for you to join in the sexual activities with your partner?	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C: The CARE

RISK OF ACTIVITIES

On a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (extremely likely), HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT YOU WOULD EXPERIENCE SOME NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCE (e.g., become sick, be injured, about yourself) if you engaged in these activities?

	NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES						
	Not at all Likely			Moderately Likely			Extremely Likely
1) Trying/using drugs others than alcohol or marijuana	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2) Missing class or work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3) Grabbing, pushing or shoving someone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4) Leaving a social event with someone I have just met	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5) Driving after drinking alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6) Making a scene in public	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7) Drinking more than 5 alcoholic drinks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8) Not studying for exam or quiz	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9) Drinking alcohol too quickly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10) Disturbing the peace	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11) Damaging/destroying public property	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12) Sex without protection against pregnancy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13) Leaving tasks or assignments for the last minute	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14) Hitting someone with a weapon or object	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

On a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (extremely likely), HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT YOU WOULD EXPERIENCE SOME NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCE (e.g., become sick, be injured, about yourself) if you engaged in these activities?

	NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES						
	Not at all Likely			Moderately Likely			Extremely Likely
15) Rock or mountain climbing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16) Sex without protection against sexually transmitted diseases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17) Playing non-contact team sports	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18) Failing to do assignments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19) Slapping someone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20) Not studying or working hard enough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21) Punching or hitting someone with fist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22) Smoking marijuana	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23) Sex with a variety of partners	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24) Snow or water skiing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25) Mixing drugs and alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26) Getting into a fight or argument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27) Involvement in sexual activities without my consent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28) Playing drinking games	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29) Sex with someone I have just met or don't know well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30) Playing individual sports	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

BENEFIT OF ACTIVITIES

On a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (extremely likely), HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT YOU WOULD EXPERIENCE SOME POSITIVE CONSEQUENCE (e.g., pleasure, win money, feel good about yourself, , etc.) if you were to engage in these activities?

	POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES						
	Not at all Likely			Moderately Likely			Extremely Likely
31) Trying/using drugs others than alcohol or marijuana	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32) Missing class or work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33) Grabbing, pushing or shoving someone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34) Leaving a social event with someone I have just met	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35) Driving after drinking alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36) Making a scene in public	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37) Drinking more than 5 alcoholic drinks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38) Not studying for exam or quiz	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39) Drinking alcohol too quickly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40) Disturbing the peace	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41) Damaging/destroying public property	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42) Sex without protection against pregnancy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43) Leaving tasks or assignments for the last minute	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44) Hitting someone with a weapon or object	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

On a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (extremely likely), HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT YOU WOULD EXPERIENCE SOME POSITIVE CONSEQUENCE (e.g., pleasure, win money, feel good about yourself, , etc.) if you were to engage in these activities?

	POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES						
	Not at all Likely			Moderately Likely			Extremely Likely
45) Rock or mountain climbing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46) Sex without protection against sexually transmitted diseases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47) Playing non-contact team sports	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48) Failing to do assignments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49) Slapping someone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50) Not studying or working hard enough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51) Punching or hitting someone with fist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52) Smoking marijuana	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53) Sex with a variety of partners	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54) Snow or water skiing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
55) Mixing drugs and alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56) Getting into a fight or argument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
57) Involvement in sexual activities without my consent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
58) Playing drinking games	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
59) Sex with someone I have just met or don't know well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
60) Playing individual sports	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

EXPECTED INVOLEMENT IN ACTIVITIES

On a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (extremely likely), HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT YOU WILL ENGAGE IN EACH OF THESE ACTIVITIES in the next 6 months?

	Expected Involvement						
	Not at all Likely			Moderately Likely			Extremely Likely
61) Trying/using drugs others than alcohol or marijuana	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
62) Missing class or work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63) Grabbing, pushing or shoving someone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64) Leaving a social event with someone I have just met	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
65) Driving after drinking alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66) Making a scene in public	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
67) Drinking more than 5 alcoholic drinks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
68) Not studying for exam or quiz	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
69) Drinking alcohol too quickly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
70) Disturbing the peace	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
71) Damaging/destroying public property	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
72) Sex without protection against pregnancy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
73) Leaving tasks or assignments for the last minute	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
74) Hitting someone with a weapon or object	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
75) Rock or mountain climbing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

On a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (extremely likely), HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT YOU WILL ENGAGE IN EACH OF THESE ACTIVITIES in the next 6 months?

	Expected Involvement						
	Not at all Likely			Moderately Likely			Extremely Likely
76) Sex without protection against sexually transmitted diseases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
77) Playing non-contact team sports	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
78) Failing to do assignments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
79) Slapping someone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
80) Not studying or working hard enough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
81) Punching or hitting someone with fist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
82) Smoking marijuana	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
83) Sex with a variety of partners	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
84) Snow or water skiing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
85) Mixing drugs and alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
86) Getting into a fight or argument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
87) Involvement in sexual activities without my consent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
88) Playing drinking games	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
89) Sex with someone I have just met or don't know well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
90) Playing individual sports	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

FREQUENCY OF INVOLVEMENT

For each of the activities listed below, please indicate how many times you have participated in this activity in the past six (6) months.

1. Tried/used drugs other than alcohol or marijuana ____
2. Missed class or work ____
3. Grabbed, pushed, or shoved someone ____
4. Left a social event with someone I have just met ____
5. Drove after drinking alcohol ____
6. Made a scene in public ____
7. Drank more than 5 alcoholic drinks on one occasion ____
8. Not studied for exam or quiz ____
9. Drank alcohol too quickly ____
10. Disturbed the peace ____
11. Damaged/destroyed public property ____
12. Sex without protection against pregnancy ____
13. Left tasks or assignments until the last minute ____
14. Hit someone with a weapon or object ____
15. Rock or mountain climbed ____
16. Sex without protection against sexually transmitted disease ____
17. Played non-contact team sports ____
18. Failed to do assignments ____
19. Slapped someone ____
20. Not studied or worked hard enough ____

For each of the activities listed below, please indicate how many times you have participated in this activity in the past six (6) months.

21. Punched or hit someone with fist ____

22. Smoked Marijuana ____

23. How many different sexual partners have you had in the past 6 months? ____

24. Snow or water skied ____

25. Mixed drugs or alcohol ____

26. Got into a fight or argument ____

27. Involved in sexual activities without my consent ____

28. Played drinking games _____

29. Sex with someone I have just met or don't know well ____

30. Played individual sports ____